1	Wayne S. Kreger
_	wkreger@maklawyers.com
2	Bevin Allen
3	ballen@maklawyers.com MILSTEIN, ADELMAN, & KREGER, LLP 2800 Donald Douglas Loop N
4	Santa Monica, CA 90405 (310) 396-9600
5	(310) 396-9635 (Fax)
6	Harold M. Hewell hmhewell@hewell-lawfirm.com HEWELL LAW FIRM, APC
7	402 W. Broadway, 4th Floor San Diego, CA 92101
8	(619) 235-6854 (619) 235-9122
9	Howard M. Rubenstein
10	howardr@pdq.net) 914 Waters Avenue, Suite 20 Aspen, Colorado 81611
11	(832) 715-2788 (cell)
12	Dennis G. Pantazis Craig L. Lowell
13	WIĞGINS, CHILDS, QUINN & PANTAZIS, LLC 309 19th Street North,
14	Birmingham, Alabama 35203 (205) 314-0500
15	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
16	
17	Sidney K. Kanazawa (SBN 84608) skanazawa@mcguirewoods.com McGUIREWOODS LLP
18	1800 Century Park East, 8th Floor Los Angeles, California 90067
19	Telephone: (310) 315-8200 Facsimile: (310) 315-8210
20	David J. Noonan (SBN 55966) djn@knlh.com
21	Jill E. Randall (SBN 229680) jrandall@knlh.com
22	KIRBY NOONAN LANCE & HOGE LLP 600 West Broadway, Suite 1100
23	San Diego, California 92101-3387 Telephone (619) 231-8666
24	Facsimile (619) 231-9593
25	James C. Barton, Jr., Esq. (Bar Number: ASB-0237-B51J) jbartonjr@johnstonbarton.com
26	JOHNSON BARTON PROCTOR & ROSE LLP 569 Colonial Brookwood Center, Suite 901 Birmingham, Al. 35200
27	Birmingham, AL 35209 (205) 458-9441 (direct dial) (205) 458-9500 (fax)
28	Attorneys for Defendant McNeil-PPC, Inc.

1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10 11	TERRI ORTIZ, as an individual consumer and on behalf of ADRIAN ALEXANDER ORTIZ-FLORES, a minor; CHUCK	CASE NO. 07 CV 0678 BEN (CAB) [Consolidated with 08 CV 0536 BEN(CAB)]	
12	TIDWELL, as an individual consumer and on behalf of WILLIAM TIDWELL, a		
13	minor; KRISTIN MATTHIS , as an individual consumer and on behalf of KENDALL MATTHIS , a minor and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, vs.	JOINT MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE OF SCHEDULING ORDER DATES	
14			
15			
16			
17	MCNEIL-PPC, INC., a New Jersey		
18	corporation,		
19	Defendant.		
20			
21		-	
22	1. This Joint Motion is submitted	for the consolidate matters of Ortiz-Flores v.	
23	McNeil-PPC, Inc., Case No. 07 CV 0678 BEN ((CAB), (S.D. Cal.) ("Ortiz-Flores") and Pointer v.	
24	McNeil-PPC, Inc., Case No. 08 CV0536-BEN (CAB) ("Pointer") cases. As more specifically		
25	detailed below, this Joint Motion requests that certain dates contained in the Court's May 15, 2009		
26	Order Granting Joint Motion to Modify Dates Set Forth in the January 25, 2008 Scheduling Orde		
27	[Doc. No. 37] be continued.		
28	2. Plaintiffs in the consolidated <i>Orto</i>	iz-Flores and Pointer cases are referred to herein	
		2	
	JOINT MOTION F	OR CONTINUANCE	

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

- 3. Defendant McNeil-PCC, Inc. is a defendant in both cases and is referred to herein as "Defendant."
 - 4. Plaintiffs and Defendant are referred to collectively herein as the 'Parties."
- 5. This Court entered a Scheduling Order on January 25, 2008, assigning various deadlines in this matter [Doc. NO. 21].
- 6. The Scheduling Order included deadlines of April 28, 2008 for Plaintiffs to file their Motion for Class Certification, and provided for a Mandatory Settlement Conference on May 1, 2008 with Settlement Conference statements due on April 24, 2008.
- 7. On April 8, 2008, the parties filed a joint motion to continue certain dates set forth in the January 25, 2008 Scheduling Order. The continuance was requested because the parties were meeting and conferring regarding the production of certain defense documents and because Defendants' witnesses for Plaintiffs' April 2, 2008 Rule 30(b)(6) deposition notice were engaged in a companywide meeting, and Defendants were unable to confirm the dates of availability for their witnesses. The Court entered the Order Granting the continuance of these dates on April 16, 2009 [Doc.No.34].
- 8. On May 6, 2008, the parties filed a joint motion to further continue certain dates set forth in the January 25, 2008. The joint motion was again based upon the availability of Defendants' witnesses in response to Plaintiffs' April 2, 2008 Rule 30(b)(6) deposition notice. The Court entered the Order granting the further continuance on May 15, 2008 [Doc.No.36].
- 9. On March 13, 2008, the Parties held a telephonic meet and confer regarding Defendant's March 4, 2008 document production in this matter. During the telephonic conference, Plaintiffs' counsel notified Defendant's counsel that Plaintiffs believed that certain documents had not been produced in connection with their Request for Production of Documents. Plaintiffs' counsel outlined various areas of documentation that were missing from the document production. Defendant's counsel assured Plaintiffs' counsel that they would look into the issue and determine if there were additional documents to be produced.
 - 10. On April 2, 2008, Plaintiffs noticed Rule 30(b)(6) depositions. In subsequent

4

9

10

11

12

14 15

13

16

17

18 19

15.

21

20

23 24

25 26

27 28

documents related to the 30(b)(6) witnesses, but that Defendant's counsel was unable to open the 22 files on the disc to determine their relevancy to the subject action. On Sunday, May 25, 2008, between 6:45 pm and 7:30pm PST, Plaintiffs received 16.

the supplemental production comprised of approximately 1,000 additional pages of documents. Defendant's position is that the documents being produced primarily relate to the implementation of the recall (a subject not included in the 30(b)(6) deposition notice) and that many of the

documents were drafts and copies of documents already produced. Plaintiffs' position is that the

documents, as previously represented, are the files of the witnesses being deposed and are

11. On April 7, 2008, Defendants informed Plaintiffs' counsel that they had located additional documents for further production, and that they would produce those documents to

conversations between Plaintiffs' counsel and Defendant's counsel, and based upon the

availability of the witnesses, the parties agreed to schedule the 30(b)(6) depositions for Tuesday,

Plaintiffs. Shortly thereafter, Plaintiffs received an additional 264 pages of documents.

Plaintiffs' counsel that he was expecting additional documents on a disc the next day.

May 27, 2008 and Wednesday, May 28, 2008 in New Jersey.

12. At approximately 4:00 p.m. on Friday, May 23, 2008, Defendant's counsel (Sidney Kanazawa) called Plaintiffs' counsel (Bevin Allen) to inform her that additional documents had been located and would be produced. Mr. Kanazawa informed Ms. Allen that these documents were the files of the 30(b)(6) witnesses that were scheduled to take place the following business day. Defendant's counsel arranged for the documents he had received to be duplicated and forwarded to Plaintiffs' counsel the same business day. Defendant's counsel also advised

- 13. At approximately 4:15 p.m. PST on Friday May 23, 2008, defense counsel (Kanazawa) sent Plaintiffs' counsel (Allen) an e-mail attaching two PowerPoint presentations (totaling 10 pages) that related to the items in the 30(b)(6) notice.
- At approximately 6:00 p.m. PST on Friday, May 23, 2008, Plaintiffs' counsel 14. received a disc containing 326 pages of documents.

informed Plaintiffs' counsel that Defendant's counsel had received a disk containing additional

On Saturday, May 24, 2008, at approximately 2:30 pm PST, Defendant's counsel

- 17. In total, Defendants produced nearly 1300 pages of documents less than one business day (Monday, May 26, 2008 was a holiday) prior to the date of the scheduled depositions.
- 18. Over the course of the weekend, counsel for the parties discussed whether to go forward with the April 2, 2008 Rule 30(b)(6) depositions. Ultimately, the parties agreed to continue the depositions as a result of the issues raised due to the timing of the supplemental production, and to jointly request a continuance of the deadlines for the certification motion and the date of the Mandatory Settlement Conference.
- 19. The current Order regarding the scheduling of this matter requires that Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification be filed June 17, 2008, a Mandatory Settlement Conference is set for June 17, 2008 with the Parties' Confidential Settlement Statements due on June 10, 2008.
- 20. Due to the issues presented over the weekend, the Parties agree to a further continuance of the deadlines for the Class Certification Motion, the Mandatory Settlement Conference Statement, as well as the date of the Mandatory Settlement Conference itself. Defendant's counsel, Sidney K. Kanazawa, has assured Plaintiffs' counsel that he is diligently determining whether there are additional documents for production and simultaneously obtaining new deposition dates from the witnesses so that the April 2, 2008 Rule 30(b)(6) depositions can take place as soon as practical, with enough time for Plaintiffs' counsel to review any additional documents that may be located and in sufficient time to complete the depositions in advance of the deadlines to file the Motion for Class Certification Motion, the Mandatory Settlement Conference Statement, as well as the date of the Mandatory Settlement Conference itself.

NOW, therefore, THE PARTIES AGREE AND JOINTLY MOVE:

1. The deadline for Plaintiffs to file their Motion for Class Certification is hereby continued for an additional four weeks. The new deadline for Plaintiffs to file this Motion is July 16, 2008.

1	1 2. The date of the Mandatory Settler	ment Conference is hereby continued for two		
2	2 weeks. The new date for the Mandatory Settler	ment Conference is July 9, 2008, or as soon		
3	thereafter as the Court's calendar allows.			
4	4 3. In accordance with the Court's Janu	3. In accordance with the Court's January 25, 2008 scheduling order, the Parties are to		
5	5 submit confidential settlement statements directly	submit confidential settlement statements directly to chambers at least seven (7) calendar days		
6	prior the date set for the Mandatory Settlement Conference.			
7	4. Defendant agrees to answer Plaintiffs' Amended Consolidated Complaint within			
8	seven (7) days of service of the amended consolidated complaint or within two (2) business days			
9	before the deadline for the motion for class certification, whichever is later, but in all events			
10	defendant will answer within 20 days of the service of the complaint.			
11	11			
12	Dated: June 2, 2008 MILSTE	N, ADELMAN, & KREGER, LLP		
13	13			
14	By: <u>/s/</u>	Bevin Allen		
15	Atto	Bevin M. Allen orneys for Plaintiffs Ortiz-Flores and Pointer,		
16	et a			
17	Detad: June 2, 2009 MCCLIE	EWOODS LLP		
18				
19	By: /s/	Sidney K. Kanazawa (per email authority on y 30, 2008)		
20	20	Sidney K. Kanazawa orneys for Defendant		
21		Neil-PPC, Inc.		
22	22			
23	23			
24	24			
25	25			
26	26			
27	27			
28	28			